DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 285 JC 700 024

AUTHOR PORTER, ADALBERT D.
TITLE FACULTY SENATES IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: FIVE YEARS OF OPERATION.
PUB DATE AUG 69
NOTE 39P.; SEMINAR PAPER

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS, *GOVERNANCE, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *POLICY FORMATION
IDENTIFIERS *CALIFORNIA

ABSTRACT

REVIEWED IN THIS REPORT ARE THE STEPS THAT LED TO THE FORMATION OF FACULTY SENATES IN CALIFORNIA. THROUGH INTERVIEWS, THE FUNCTIONS OF SUCH SENATES AND THEIR CURRENT STATUS WERE DETERMINED AND GUIDELINES WERE FORMULATED THAT WOULD LEAD TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCEPT OF SHARED AUTHORITY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE. INTERVIEWING ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTIES IN URBAN AND RURAL JUNIOR COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA, THE AUTHOR FOUND FEW DIFFERENCES IN POINTS OF VIEW REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY SENATE. NOT AVAILABLE IN HARD COPY DUE TO MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENT. (MC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036285

# Faculty Senates in California Community Colleges: Five years of operation.

A Report
presented to
Dr. B. Lamar Johnson
University of California at Los Angeles

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Course
Education 470C.

By
Adalbert D.. Porter
August 1969.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 1 9 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 700 024

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| | Purposes | 2 |
| | Significance of Study | 2. |
| | Limitations | 3 |
| II. | Review of the Literature | 5 |
| III. | Interviews | 17 |
| IV. | Summary and Conclusions | 32 |
| | Summary | 32 |
| | Conclusions | 34 |
| Bibliography | | 36 |

## Chapter I.

## Introduction

Academic senates in universities AND state colleges have had the opportunity to be partners with administrations in the governance of their institutions for many years.

The junior college faculties had never participated in shared authority with their administration in institutional governance. But with the passage of the Donahue Act of 1960, which elevated the community to the heady atmosphere of higher education in California, the community college faculties began to see themselves, for the first time, as equals to their partners in higher education.

The move from administrative dominance or primacy of the present toward shared authority in college governance had now become one of the first orders of business in many community colleges. The topic which had been heard for so many years, "Democracy in School Administration", was now the battle cry of the community college faculties.

The opportunity for organizing faculty senates in California community colleges was given legitimacy by the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 48. At long last the faculty members of community colleges were able to feel that they were really part of higher education and had gained a semblance of respectability and were able to identify with their partners in higher education, the

universities and state colleges..

The community college senates have been in operation for a full five years and the strides made toward their participation in college governance has had road blocks and detours in its path, but these strides, no matter how short, have been moving forward steadily toward an increased sharing of authority with administration in the governance of the community colleges.

## Purposes

It was the purpose of this study to (1) review the steps leading to the formation of faculty senates, (2) determine the functions of community college faculty senates, (3) determine the current status of faculty senates from selected interviews with faculty and administrators of community colleges, and (4) formulate guidelines which may lead to better understanding and collegiality in the shared auth,ority of community college governance.

## Significance of Study

The community college faculty senates have been in operation for five years in California, and a study of the trials and tribulations which occurred during this period of incubation may shed some light on future actions to be taken by both administration and faculty members in the development of a collegial atmosphere in institutional governance.

In a paper presented by John Lombardi, Assistant

Superintendent, Los Angeles Junior College District, at a Junior College Leadership Program, sponsored by U.C.L.A., he observed that the:

> Basic idea of collegiality is the absence of the superior-subordinate relationship so essential in business and military organizations. In a college, the faculty are educational and intellectual equals of the president. (1:43)

With the development of strong collegial structure within the community college, the traditional role of the faculty which has been that of advisement without responsibility or policy determination in college governance, there will evolve a true partnership between the president and the faculty in the sharing of authority for governing their college.

Community college senates, during this five year period, have undergone organizational problems, a search for their identity in the institutional structure, a struggle for egalitarianism with the administration and the flexing of their muscles to assert a new and unfamiliar power that they never had before.

During this period they have learned their strengths and limitations, and by applying the lessons they have learned to the future, the growth and development of the faculty senate as a full partner in institutional governance will move at a steady, cooperative fulfilling pace.

## Limitations

The time limit for the preparation of this paper

limited the depth of the study.

The interviews sample was small and could not be used as a representative sample for all community colleges.

There was no attempt made to evaluate the success of the faculty senates in the colleges visited.

The responses to the questionnaire were personal opinions of the interviewee and could have some degree of prejudice, depending on which side of the desk they were sitting.

## Chapter II.

## Review of the Literature.

The Caminetti Act of 1907 established post-highschool education as a reality in California, and the subsequent legislation strengthened, liberalized and expanded the concept of public junior college education in California. During this period the junior college faculty, small at first, grew in size as the concept of the junior college expanded out of all proportions to the educated prognostications of the experts.

Recruited, at first, from the ranks of secondary education, the junior college instructors still had a stronger affinity for his past association with the high-schools than they did with universities and colleges. John Lombardi, writing in the Junior College Journal, feels that this could be attributed to several factors: (1) the lack of junior college faculty statewide organization, and (2) teachers transferring from high schools to junior colleges had new freedom from class loads, increased salaries, and as a consequence, this contrast made the junior college instructor more complacent over a longer period of time. (2:9)

The increase in size of the junior colleges in California brought forth in faculties the feeling of insecurity and the loss of identity with the organization. Robert Presthus brings this into focus when he observed:

> Alienation among faculty members is associated with size, and the bigger the school, the more anxiety among faculty men, and more tension between administration and faculty. (3:22)

The faculties of junior colleges were searching for some group or groups that would bring them together and give them identity, but, instead of looking internally for the development of a close knit organization to represent them, they attached themselves to external organizations such as the California Teachers Association, which represented eighty percent of the teachers in California. The C.T.A. was trying to be all things to all people as Bill Priest points out, and it wasn't long before the junior college faculty realized that the C.T.A. was more interested in the elementary and secondary majority than they were in them. (4:5)

Still searching for organizations to assist them, some junior college faculties started chapters of the American Federation of Teachers in their colleges. Daniel Holloway stated:

> If our educational institutions resemble General Motors plants in size and spirit: (if our) administrators think and talk like G.M. executives, we should not be surprised if our faculties begin "to think like members of the United Auto Workers." (5:24)

This move for external assistance, even to the acceptance of a labor union for professional people, was a search for identity and a longing for recognition.

The California Junior College Association had a golden opportunity for the development of a strong faculty group

within their organization. However, they made a drastic error by subordinating the role of the faculty in the C.J.C.A. This move elicited accusations from the faculty members of bureaucratic control of the C.J.C.A. to the exclusion of any faculty participation.

Junior college faculty members took matters into their own hands and formed their own statewide faculty organization, the California Junior College Faculty Association. This organization was still an external group and did not really fulfill all the desires of the junior college faculties for a share in the governance of their college. (4:6)

Burton Clark makes the point which seemed to guide junior college faculties from the external groups to the internal group, when he stated:

> Movement of authority from external groups to internal groups is the increasing size of the organization. Large scale removes the outside from the knowledge about observation of and involvement in daily operations. (6:31)

The organizations which have been reviewed, although external to the junior college, had great influence with and on the junior college faculties. But as observed by Dr. Irv Boxer, in an interview, he felt that these external groups had a divisive effect on the faculty, as there was continual "pulling and hauling" of the faculty to join the various groups. (7)

Membership in these groups was never completely satisfactory to the junior college faculties as their needs

were not met and the expectation of identity with the groups did not leave much to be desired.

The Donahue Act of 1960, which legalized the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, joined the junior college with the other segments of higher education in the state. This gave the junior college status as a partner with the University of California, and the State Colleges.

There was immediate acceptance by the junior college faculties as having attained a new identity. No longer did the past affinity for highschool ties exist, but now they could identify with the "Community of higher education." Even though the faculty identify with higher education rather than secondary education, and although they conclude that their rights, privileges and responsibilities must be commensurate with their official membership in higher education, the president - faculty relationships do not parallel exactly those of senior institutions. (1:44)

However, junior college faculties, as they see themselves now, identify with their counterparts of higher education and look to them for guidance in striving for more participation in institutional governance. (4:5)

Becoming a member of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education was just one more brick in the structure that enhanced and strengthened the junior college faculty's self concept in its new role, as a full partner in higher education.

At this time there was not a concerted effort for legislation of junior college faculty senates, but there was a definite strengthening of the faculty associations, the body most represenative of the faculty. This was the noticeable move from an external group to an internal group to represent the faculty in its never ending drive for shared authority in college governance.

Dr. Wade Thomas of Santa Monica City College stated in an interview that the faculty association at his college had its inception in 1951, and had rights and powers similar to the present day senate. (8). Dr. John McDonald of Mira Costa College pointed out to this interviewer that his college organized a senate in 1961, and that the transition to the legalized senate was orderly and not difficult. (9)

Two external groups, the A.F.T. and the C.J.C.F.A., requested the state legislature, in 1963, to pass assembly concurrent resolution number 48, providing for the establishment of an academic senate or faculty council in each junior college.

This Act reads:

> Whereas, it is traditional that faculty members institutions of higher learning participate in policy formation on academic and professional matters at such institutions through academic senates and councils; and
> Whereas, the master plan recognizes the junior colleges as an integral part of the system of higher education in California, and
> Whereas, the trustees of the state colleges have established a statewide faculty senate thereby leaving the junior college system

> the only remaining member of the tripartite master plan for higher education in California without such a faculty organization; and Whereas, the junior colleges are to be organized and administered as a separate and independent system of higher education under the state board of education now, therefore, be it
> Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, that the state board of education is hereby requested to provide for the establishment of each junior college of an academic senate council wherein the faculty members shall be freely selected by their colleagues for the p urpose of representing them in the formation of policy on academic and professional matters at such junior colleges;..."(10)

John Lombardi feels that this Act "expresses succinctly the identification of the junior college with higher education." (2:10)

Vavoulis, in his survey of Knitzers study "Faculty Handbooks in 1961", reported that faculty handbooks disclosed that the role of the faculty prior to the enactment of A.C.R. No. 48, was not conceived in terms of policy-determination, but rather in terms emphasizing procedural information only. (11:32) However, a survey, by this writer, of faculty handbooks since the legalizing of faculty senates, disclosed that the faculty handbooks of several junior colleges were explicit in the purposes of the faculty senate. The purposes of the faculty senate as stated by Moorpark College Faculty Handbook, is representative of handbooks surveyed. It reads:

(1) Purposes
  (a) To participate in the formation of policies and procedures in academic professional and salary matters.
  (b) To facilitate communication among faculty administration and governing boards in all matters relating to junior college education.

(2) Membership
  (a) All certificated personnel employed by the college for at least eight hours per week, whose current assignment places them on the "Salary Schedule for Certificated Staff" and/or does not require an administrative credential, shall be members.
  (b) Members may resign at any time by notifying the President of the Senate in writing. (12:34)

Additional information as to the structure of the senate was included in the handbook, but the sections quoted above seemed to be the most pertinent innovation over previous handbooks.

The functions of the academic senate have not been clearly defined. In interviews with both administrators and faculty, they felt that there is a need for a more definitive statement by legal act to place the functions of the senate in the proper perspective. They also agreed that it was the obligation of the administration and faculty to join together in formalizing a structure that could be used in clearly defining faculty participation in college governance.

Even though the state board of education adopted the faculty point of view in defining the faculty,

> faculty as those certificated persons who teach full time as junior college or other full time certificated persons, who do not perform services for the college that require an administrative or supervisory credential (13)

There has been very little success in establishing true identification of faculty senate functions.

Here again, the external groups, the A.F.T., and the C.J.C.F.A., have picked up the loose ball and tried to make yardage withit, but have only been able to have opinions rendered by county councils that have not strengthened the position of the faculty senates.

Like a new marriage, the faculty senate and administration were making adjustments to each other on the composition and functions of the faculty senate, and while this was taking place, a serpent in the guise of new legislation came into the garden of Eden and threatened the very existence of the faculty senate.

This serpent was the Winton Act (Education Code Section 13080-13088) which had these distinguishing features:

1. It mandates that school districts "shall meet and confer with employee representatives. Statement of typical statutes stipulate terms of "to negotiate in good faith".
2. It provides that teachers shall be represented on a proportional basis when more than one teacher organization is involved.
3. No impasse procedure is stipulated. (15:21)

No other law which pertains to education is more controversial as far as the junior colleges are concerned.

All of the interviewees stated:

> There is no place for the Winton Act in junior colleges. We agree that it is

> necessary for elementary and secondary schools, but we have legality, "to meet and confer" in A.C.R. No.48.

The Winton Act has done more to confuse the issue of faculty representation in junior colleges than any other act.

After years of trying to obtain recognition and participation in college governance, the Winton Act places an obstacle to orderly negotiations between administration and faculty senates by adding a third dimension, negotiating council, to an already tenuous situation. (16)

This study will not describe the controversies concerning policy making which exists between administrators and faculty senates. This subject has been ably reviewed in a report "Policy-Making in the Junior College: Faculty and Administration Sales and Relationships" by Bruce L. Paulsen.

He states:

> There is nothing new about the problem of faculty and administration controversy over their respective sales in policy making; however, the intensity of the controversy and the relevance of the issue, certainly makes it a problem of current critical concern. --Today, the questions of authority and responsibility for governance seem to be manifesting themselves in junior college segments of higher education. (15:1)

At present, one must surely recognize that there is a change taking place in junior college governance. There is a shifting to a newer system of management where participation on the continuum is from "little participation" to "much participation." (17)

Likert in his book "New Patterns of Management" provides a rough continuum which he labels from "a" to "l" and states that:

> participation will increase employee motivation and productivity, and that the greater the amount of participation the greater the beneficial effect. (17:242)

He also observed:

> Participation should not be thought of as a single process or activity, but rather as a whole range of processes and activities. (17:242)

B. Lamar Johnson presented ten major principles in formulating guidelines for faculty participation in administrative affairs of the college, as follows:

1. Responsibility for administration and operation of junior colleges in California and many other states is, by law, vested in a board of trustees.

2. Powers and responsibilities of administration and other faculty are, and must be, assigned by the board of trustees.

3. If the insights, views, and judgments of the faculty are absent in college policy, the college suffers.

4. The powers and responsibilities of board members, college administrative officers, and other staff members must be clearly stated and readily available, usually in the form of a board policy manual and a faculty handbook or codebook.

5. Authority to study, recommend, and advise on college policy and operation can be a notably important power..

6. If the faculty, through committee assignments, etc., spends an undue amount of time on administration, the college suffers.

7. Since the community college must be responsive to community needs, efficiency and flexibility must be built into any plan of operation.

8. Most community colleges are comprehensive in nature, the academic division being only a part of the total program; hence, the word "academic" should be omitted from the name of any senate, council, or other faculty organization purporting

to represent the faculty as a whole.

9. When the same facts on an issue are available to both administration and faculty, there is usually agreement on a solution.
   a. This suggests establishing the means for having the facts available, perhaps through an office of institutional research.
   b. This suggests also having effective lines of communication between administration and faculty.

10. There is no single best plan of organization for faculty participation in college affairs. The success of any plan must ultimately depend on a feeling of goodwill between administration and staff. (18)

These guidelines show increases in participation which, like Likert's observations, increase motivation, efficiency, productivity and a spirit of cooperation not previously attainable under autocratic administration.

Louis Reiss proposes a continuum of participation in college governance with graduations from:

Administrative Dominancy
decisions made unilaterally by administration without faculty participation.
Administrative Primacy
Administration consults with faculty but makes policy and decisions.
Shared Authority
Both share effective influence in decision making.
Faculty Primacy
Prior consultation with administration but decision making with faculty.
Faculty Dominance
Unilateral decision making by faculty. (19)

Reiss describes the junior college as generally administrative Primacy, but notes that there is evidence that the increase in consultation with faculty senates will lead to more shared authority.

During the five years of faculty senate existence as a legal entity, much has been accomplished to bring about change in participation of the faculty in college governance, but from a survey of the literature and direct interviews with faculty and administrators, one recognizes that only the surface has been scratched.

Both faculty and administrators are looking forward to the next five years of faculty participation, some eagerly, others with apprehension. However, faculty participation is a reality and its strength in partnership of school governance will increase.

## Chapter III.

## Interviews

Do you feel that the law A.C.R. No. 48 has been a valuable addition to community colleges in the State? Why?

Administrators

To this question all administrators answered yes, but gave individual opinions, such as:

> This law was a mandate from the legislature to create this body in community colleges, and the establishment of a faculty senate in the community college was long overdue.
>
> Opened avenues of communication which had been "garbled" by the old faculty association and administration.
>
> Gave the faculty an opportunity to organize under legal auspices and express opinions.
>
> Gave the faculty a voice in constitutional affairs.
>
> It has given the administration the opportunity to use the faculty senate in policy-making.
>
> Has made the faculty more aware of their responsibilities in institutional planning and render invaluable assistance to administrators.
>
> The law has helped prevent power struggles from external professional organizations, who were influencing faculty and causing organizational havoc.

All administrators were strongly opposed to the Winton Act and hoped it could be set aside as far as community

college was concerned. They felt the Winton Act was in direct conflict with A.C.R. No. 48, which was ideally suited for the purpose of meeting and conferring.

Faculty

All faculty interviewed gave a strong definite yes to this question.

teacher

Community college is a part of higher education in California and it should be treated like they are partners with universities and state colleges.

Provided legal basis for faculty advisement to administration and board of governors.

Even though there were some strong faculty associations, they had no prior legal status.

The law does not restrict topics which can be discussed by faculty senate and administration.

Gave faculty understanding of administrative responsibility.

This law had a solidifying influence on external groups which represented the faculty in the past, and brought them together in one internal group.

Developed a stronger voice in institutional policy-making.

The law was probably brought about because administrators ignored faculty pleas and recommendations for a stronger part in determining "policy".

All the faculty people interviewed stated that the Winton Act of 1965 was the primary inhibiter to an orderly method of negotiation between the faculty senate and administration. They felt the Winton Act was needed for

elementary and secondary schools in California, but with A.C.R. No. 48 the junior college had the necessary vehicle to carry them toward their goal. They stated their senates are working with the new academic senate for California community colleges in trying to get the community colleges out from under the Winton Act, and hoped this could be accomplished within the next year.

What do you feel has been the most important aspect of the faculty senate in your college in the last five years?

Administrators

> Unifying effect on the faculty by bringing together of all parties, C.T.A., A.F.T., A.A.U.P., and old faculty associations.
>
> Developed lateral communication between divisions which had previously been difficult due to their own vested interest which narrowed their horizons. They now look at the institutional picture as a whole.
>
> Brings forth creative ideas which had been inhibited in the past.
>
> Administration can obtain support of faculty by asking the faculty senate to help in arriving at decisions.
>
> Brought about immediate new communication channels.
>
> Better cooperation with administration and board.
>
> The senate sits on the committee to select administrative personnel.

One administrator said he did not have to act as "mediator" any more between board and faculty on salary matters as he and the senate ironed out all differences and presented a united front to the board.

All administrators said there were still some tensions

but these were not serious and could be negotiated to the satisfaction of both parties.

Another administrator felt that the ecoperation of his senate, after they became familiar with institutional problems, was the greatest thing that happened during the five year period.

Faculty

Served to bring about communication among all parts of the institution, faculty, students, administration and board.

Chairman of the senate now has a permanent "slot" on the board.

Provided machinery for discussion.

More voice in policy-making, and "it works at our college".

"The students used to play the faculty against the administration, but now, with the lines of communication open, the faculty and administration have their eyes open and work well together in all areas."

Cut down on inside politics because faculty is now a unit which supports it senate.

"It has been slow but it is now sure, - our administrator realizes the importance of open lines of communication. This was difficult to overcome, but the next few years will see a complete openess in all matters."

"When we go to the board there is never any friction between the administrator and the senate, because we have come to an understanding prior to the board meeting."

"We have developed a mixed group composed of administration, faculty and students, which work on policy recommendations.

This procedure has had outstanding results.

Does your faculty participate in policy-making decisions?

Administrators

"Yes, in the last two years I have tried to involve the faculty senate in every policy to be presented to the board, but sometimes it takes them so long to reach a decision that it is necessary for me to make an independent decision."

"From the inception of the senate under A.C.R. No.48, I have gradually brought them into all policy-making areas of the institution."

"We had, at our college, a very strong faculty council which organized the 1961 and they sat on the policy-making body at that time. The present system was derived from the plan which was established in 1961, and the senate now takes the council's place on the policy body. If any policy affects the faculty, it must be voted on by the entire faculty within thirty days of the formulation of that policy. If the faculty rejects the new policy, it is not presented to the board for ratification."
"This is the key to our existence at our college, and the faculty senate plays a very strong role in all policy issues."

Faculty

"The senate being part of the policy-making body has just started at our college. We have had to force our way into this area as our president is a very strong man and feels the faculty senate must prove itself each time to be in on the formulating of policy. But times will change."

"Our senate sometimes seems to have a majority of administration leaning people on it, and I feel the senate is manipulated by the administrator. Also, the administrator gives 'lip service' to the senate's role in policy-making and only lets us work on really minor policy matters."

> "Our senate is very much a part of the policy formulating process, and our administration wouldn't have it any other way."
>
> "We are in advisory capacity, but the way our administrative council is organized, there must be concurrence by both faculty senate and administration for the establishment of policy. If, however, there is not concurrence, the senate may present its views to the board unimpeded by administrative comment."

It was interesting to note the different conceptions of the administration and faculty senate on this question. The administrators, to a man, felt they really let the senate have a voice in policy, but the faculty, except for one college, felt they had to either force the issue or were just being thrown tid bits to keep them placated.

Has the faculty senate been cooperative with the administration and the board?

Administrators

The administrators agreed that on the whole the faculty was quite cooperative with them and the board.

One administrator said On the most important matters that his school has had this year, student unrest, " the faculty senate has been behind the administration and board 100%, and this helped straighten out this problem in very short order." He also stated that sometimes it appeared that the senate became more antagonistic on principal issues than on the truly important ones, which led him to believe that they wanted to be sure they were still active.

Faculty

The faculty agree that on the whole they cooperated with the board. However, some faculty members said they reserved the right to disagree, with policy change, and felt more communication with both administration and board would encourage a better feeling of cooperation.

One faculty senate member said he felt he could present the faculty case to the board and he would not be ignored. This gave a good feeling of cooperation.

Do you ask for assistance from your senate on policy or does the senate initiate its own studies on policy for recommendation to the administration?

Administrators

All the administrators stated this is accomplished both ways.

One administrator said he welcomed faculty initiated ideas for new policy. He also said he has always had the good fortune to have close liaison with the senate as the administrators are included as senate members.

Faculty

All agreed that the administration asks for assistance on policy issues. However, some of the faculty feel that the administrators ask for assistance only on peripheral issues and not on the truly important issues that have to do with policy.

One faculty member said, "It's up to the senate to educate the administrators, that the faculty senate is a responsible body and they are working toward the same goal.

a smoother operating institution.

Did your senate begin by making demands, or did it make cautious well defined moves in its development?

Administrators

The administrators agreed that the senate, at their colleges, make cautious well defined moves in organizing, and did not make demands.

One administrator stated that he "felt if his senate had come out of its corner swinging with demands, the whole conception of senate participation in policy formulation, would have collapsed, because it would have alienated an already apprehensive board of trustees, and the damage done would have been irreparable."

Faculty

All faculty interviewed said that their senate was formed with deliberation and that they did not make demands or go out of their way to find areas of concern just to be arbitrary, but, instead, they made cautious well defined moves in their development. However, all agreed that at no time were they considered to be "rubber stamps."

Do you feel that operating with a faculty senate is preferable to the days prior to the senate's inception?

Administrators

The answer to this question was an unqualified "Absolutely."

> Some of the administrators stated that prior to the senate, it was faster and easier to formulate policy, but the resulting conflicts caused so much dissention that it really didn't save any time.
>
> One administrator said "the old days were good because I could be an autocrat, but I soon found out that the faculty seemed

to be against me and it was not really as harmonious as I thought it was."

Faculty

"Yes, the operation of the institution under the present system is preferable to the past, but a democratic organization is harder to run than an autocratic one. However, the feeling we're part of the system is great."

"The old system was run by "crony" but that's all over now."

"Really, when you look back, you wonder how the faculty was able to look itself in the eye. We were more like mice than men."

Is there anything you would do differently in working with your senate, if you had a chance to start over?

Administrators

"Yes, I would put more responsibility on the senate from the start to let them develop some authority."

"No, we have had a senate here prior to A.C.R. No.48, so most of the violent struggle between external groups for control of the faculty had been overcome, and the senate was functioning smoothly by the time the law was on the books."

"Yes, the administration took a hands off attitude at the inception of the senate, so it did not have a chance to become involved. From this attitude they have been excluded from participating in senate matters, and there is an unseen line of demarcation between faculty and administration."

"If I had it to do over again, I would become involved and see that the administration would become part of the senate, as it is in some of the other community colleges."

Faculty

"Yes, only for this reason. Faculty participation in policy formulation seemed to be so agonizingly slow because the administration stood off and didn't let the senate have much responsibility. This has changed, however, and the senate and administration are full partners now. This could have occurred at a much more rapid rate if the administration had forced the senate to assume its place in institutional governance."

"No, I feel the evolution our senate went through was perfect timing. So I wouldn't change a thing."

Does your board recognize and appreciate senate action in your college, or are they apprehensive of this new source of faculty power?

Administrators

"Yes, the board appreciates the senate's participation in college policy decisions, and recognizes the value of expert opinion from the senate, but they are still a little apprehensive about what to expect in certain areas. However, on the whole, they accept the senate as one of the institution's new partners."

"Yes, the members on the board, who have worked with the senate, have respected the senate's contributions, but some individual members of the board have reservations and can't quite bring themselves to whole hearted acceptance of the senate's place in policy formulation."

"The board at our college has accepted the senate and even asks me on issues I place before the board. WhaT is the senate's reaction to this? They are nŏt the least bit apprehensive about faculty power, and I think this is because the senate was circumspect from the beginning and gained the board's respect and confidence."

Faculty

"Yes, very much so. The board has voted many times on resolutions thanking the senate for its assistance."

"Our board is still apprehensive about faculty senate power, but I feel this was precipitated by the administrator's reaction to the senate, which is stand-offish and has the effect of saying without words that he is the boss, and what does the faculty know about college issues anyway?"

"Our board, except for one member, who thinks he runs the college, appreciates the senate's participation in college activities, and are not the least apprehensive about us."

"Basically yes. It is a forward looking board and we have continuous communication with them and also extremely good rapport."

Do you feel the senate's role is clearly defined?

Administrators

"Yes, at our college, but I am not sure this is the case state-wide. Sometimes the external groups play the tune and the senate loses its effectiveness. If the Winton Act can be repealed the senate's role will be much more definitive."

"Yes, but there are still areas that need defining and the next five years should give greater clarity."

"Eliminate the Winton Act which tends to have a divisive effect on the faculty, and then the role of the senate will have definition."

Faculty

"Not as it should be. So many on the faculty are apathetic and don't take a sustained interest in the senate's position. They seem to be more interested in the professional dues paying groups that they belong to than to the senate. But, with a more definitive role assigned to the senate by the administration, the faculty will take a more active interest."

"There is a need for the faculty senate and administration to sit down and formali ze a structure for the senate's place in the institution's hierarchy. This will clearly define the senate's role."

"No, not as far as authority is concerned. Some feel the senate should deal with all issues, while others feel it should deal with only certain issues. Until a formal definition of the senate's role is established, there will continue to be organized chaos."

"I think the state law could spell out more definitely the senate's role in the community college. This would have a unifying effect on the faculty as well as define the parameters within which the senate could act."

Do you feel your senate is a strong cohesive body?

Administrators

"Yes. In the last two years it has developed cohesiveness, but before that time it was a loose conglomerate of opposing factions."

"Yes. However, it varies with the leadership of the senate chairman."

"If the chairman is strong and willing to work, the senate and faculty become a cohesive unit, but if the chairman is weak, others in the senate start pulling different ways and the senate loses its unification. It generally takes about a year for the senate to recover from weak leadership."

"Yes, our senate has always been fortunate in having strong firm leadership which has been a blessing for them, as it has developed a very strong cohesive bond with the senate."

"Our senate has really been in operation since 1951, so it has a cohesiveness developed by age and understanding of its role. Like good wine it has mellowed and become more palatable with age."

Faculty

In the last two years the senate has gained the respect of the faculty, and this has induced new strength and coalescence.

"Yes, pretty strong. The faculty now gives unanimous support to the senate's position on all issues."

"The senate has changed through the years, but still there is not the cohesiveness one would expect. The senate has ups and downs with changes in leadership, and this has had a deleterious effect on the maintenance of cohesiveness."

"We have been very careful to see that our leadership in the senate is maintained at a high level of competency, because we learned from bitter experience what weak leadership can do to the cohesiveness of the senate. It took us two years to recover and regain our former stature in the eyes of the administration and faculty."

Do you feel the junior college senate will be as powerful as the university senates?

Administrators

"No, the law pertaining to the university senates grants more power and the community college law limits the senate to 'meet and confer' but not much power. The Winton Act has had a deleterious effect on the present community college law.

"No, the community college senate is too close to the local board elected by the community, which will relinquish power, if any, very slowly, to the senate."

"No, I don't believe so, providing the structure remains the same. But, if the state community college board is granted more power, and the community college gets out from under the secondary system, yes."

"The senate of the community colleges in California are forming a statewide organization which will bring quite a lot of pressure on the legislature to change present laws, and I feel this will see achange in power for the community college senates."

Faculty

"No, but this is a personal opinion. The local board of trustees will not grant the senates additional power in decision-making, but keep this power for themselves."

"No, because there has been some negative reaction against the university of California senates and their operation. The granting of additional power

to community college senates will be extremely slow, and at present there is no legal basis for the local boards to delegate any of their functions to the faculty senates."

"Our only hope is that by forming a statewide organization of community college academic senates, will we be able to present a unified front in asking for and obtaining legislative changes in the present law, A.C.R. No. 48. This could expand the power of community college senates, but I don't think it will ever approach the power of the university of California."

From your perception, what do you feel will be the most important thrust of the faculty senates of community colleges in the next five years?

Administrators

The administrators felt the most important thrusts could be listed as follows:

1. Forced to deal with student activism.
2. Work with institutional budgetry problems.
3. Work to split community colleges from unified districts.
4. Develop a statewide community college salary schedule.
5. Expand the new A.S.C.C.C. to take a more active part in community college affairs.
6. Strive for more cooperation at all levels of higher education.
7. Seek a more active role in policy formulation and decision-making in community colleges.
8. Seek a more professional approach to gaining their goals.
9. Work diligently to repeal the Winton Act's influence on community colleges.

Faculty

The faculty feels their thrust in the next five years will be:

1. More influence in department and division policy and decisions.
2. Selection of administrators who will operate the college.
3. Seek an equality of power and responsibility in recommending policy and decision-making, but not administering it.
4. Seek release time for senate chairman.
5. Develop statewide salary schedule.
6. Seek to gain political strength through A.S. C.C.C.
7. Not try to mimic the university senates, but gain power in their own sphere of higher education.
8. Seek better working conditions.
9. Work to repeal the Winton Act.
10. Work to have all community colleges free from unified districts.

There is a distinct similarity of views by both administrators and faculty on the question of future thrusts by the community college senate, but both agree that if there has been a spirit of cooperation achieved between these two, they will work together to bring about their goals, which will place the community colleges in a stronger position in California higher education.

## Chapter IV.

## Summary and Conclusions

The literature and responses to the questionnaire by administrators and faculty identify areas of conflict and mutuality with respect to the faculty senate's role in governance in the community college.

In summarizing these areas there will be no attempt to place them in order of preference, but the administrators" and faculties' views will be separated, and the reader will be able to delineate these differences for himself.

### I. Summary

Administrators' views:

1. The faculty senate is a legal entity, but it must realize that the local board of trustees cannot delegate any of its responsibilities to the faculty senate.

2. The A.C.R. No. 48 was a definite boon to the community colleges.

3. The Winton Act was ill conceived, and should be repealed as far as it concerns the community colleges.

4. Faculty senates should maintain strong leadership.

5. Faculties are now part of higher education and should act the part.

6. Communication is the "key" to successful cooperation between the senate and the administration.

7. Many faculty members are apathetic and this has a deleterious effect on the senate's role.

8. Administrators are responsible for decisions made and if the senate wishes to be included in the decision-making, they must develop responsible attitudes.

9. The faculty's primary function is to teach, and if too much time is spent trying to administer the college, teaching suffers.

10. Faculty senates and the administration should establish formal arrangements through which the senate may exercise more influence in policy-making.

11. Continued faculty antagonism toward the administration seems to be unwarranted as the faculty gains more voice in the college operations.

12. The faculty needs to make a thorough study of budgetary conditions of the college, so they will be cognizant of fiscal problems.

13. The senate spends too much time debating issues which slows down the decision-making process.

14. Administrators should have the opportunity of being senate members.

15. The move toward collegiality of institutional operation should be an actual practice and not just theoretical.

16. Administrators need assurance that theffaculty senate is not just looking for areas of concern to keep the pot boiling.

17. Administrators recognize the right of faculty members to join without threat of reprisal any external group concerned with faculty representation, but these groups should not interfere with faculty responsibility to the college.

Faculty views:

1. Lines of communication must be open to all segments of the college.

2. The Winton Act must be repealed.

3. The administration and faculty should work to separate community colleges from unified districts.

4. The senates must have strong leadership.

5. Administration must grant faculty senates a greater role in policy-making.

6. Clear definition of senates role must be pronounced.

7. The A.S.C.C.C. must have the unqualified support of all faculty senates.

8. There should be more contact with board members to alleviate areas of concern.

9. The senate should work hard to dispel the feeling of apathy that exists within the faculty.

10. The senate should develop closer working agreements with departments and divisions.

11. The senate should have the opportunity to recommend to the board their choice to fill administrative vacancies.

12. The senate should develop a committee to review all budgetary matters of the college.

13. The senate should reserve the right to call in specialists to review the budget if it feels the administration budget is not satisfactory.

14. The senate should be the only representative of the faculty on college issues.

15. The administration must keep hands off the senate and not try to manipulate it through senate "cronies."

## II. Conclusions

The senate in community colleges is now a fact and with five years of organization and operation behind it, they can now move forward to strengthen and solidify their position.

It was interesting to note from the interviews with selected colleges that there was very little differences of opinion between the administrators and faculties. This more or less proved to me that there is actually less controversy between these two organizations than the literature gives them credit for.

To be sure, this was a small sample, but covered the

community colleges from small to large, and from urban to rural. However, a thorough study of the faculty senate and its role in the community college would be well worth undertaking.

With the formation of the new A.S.C.C.C. it would seem to this writer that they would be interested in polling their members to obtain information on which to build and expand their sphere of influence in the community colleges of California.

I propose to contact Mr. Sheridan Hegland, the new chairman of A.S.C.C.C. to see if there is any way to develop a proposal for a doctoral dissertation.

## Bibliography

### Footnotes


1 - Lombardi, John. "The Junior College President and the Faculty" - The Junior College President. Occasional Report No. 13, Los Angeles, California, U.C.L.A., May, 1969.

2 - Lombardi, John. "Faculty in the Administrative Process". Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 9-15.

3 - Presthers, Robert. "University Bosses. The Executive Conquest of Academe". New Republic 152 20-24 February 20, 1965.

4 - Priest, Bill J. "Faculty Administrator Relationships". Junior College Journal XXXIV(March 1964) 4-8..

5 - Hallowell, Daniel. "What's Wrong With Our Students". New Republic 152 p24, February 20, 1965..

6 - Clark, Burton. "Power and Authority - Emerging Trends and Aspirations" Center for Study of Higher Education. University of California, 1964.

7 - Boxer, Irv - interview El Camino College, 1969.

8 - Thomas, Wade - interview, Santa Monica City College, 1969.

9 - McDonald, John - interview, Mira Costa College, 1969.

10- California Statutes, 1963, p. 4873.

11- Vavoulis, Alexander. "A Faculty Role in Academic Policy-Making." Junior College Journal XXXIV, April, 1964, p.32.

12 -Moorpark Faculty Handbook, Moorpark, California 1968, p.34.

13- California Administrative Code, Sec. 2, Section 1316.

14- Kennedy, Harold W., County Council to J.W. Mears, President and Superintendent Cerritos College, Re: Faculty Senate of Cerritos College, March 8, 1965, p.3.

15- Paulsen, Bruce L. "Policy-Making in the Junior College: Faculty and Administration Sales and Relationships, unpublished report U.C.L.A. graduate school of education, December, 1968.

16 - Tees, Emil O., Chief Bureau of Junior College Education to Superintendents.

17 - Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management, New York. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961.

18 - B. Lamar Johnson, "Principles of Faculty Participation" (presentation made at the Advanced Workshop in Junior College Administration at Berkeley California, (July 9, 1965.)

19 - Reiss, Louis C. "Faculty Governance in Turmoil: Who Speaks for the Junior College Professor?" California Junior College Faculty Association, Long Beach, 1967.